



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the author of this book has mainly followed. With it as a clue, he steadily pursues his way towards the summit of his theme. He shows us that if we follow out faithfully the implications of the activities of reason in science, morality and so forth, none of these separate spheres is self-contained and self-subsistent. Each of them comes for the solution of its final problems to something above and beyond itself. And as we rise from the level of the lower to the level of the higher we are brought at last to the completion of them all in religion. Religion and God, these are the profound realities, the ultimate issues, to which *The Spiritual Ascent of Man* leads us. But this is not the end of the matter. For, as the author insists, religion is not merely *knowing*; it is also *being*. And since *being* for us men consists in activity, *being* necessarily means *doing*. To be sure, *knowing* is likewise *doing*. But the *doing* that is here in question is the doing that embraces the whole of our activities. For every side of our being a place must be found in religion; and any religion that refuses to recognise this is doomed to end in barrenness and failure. Some parts of the book are distinctly hard. We do not complain of this. Religion is worth all the pains we may take to understand and appreciate it.

We whole-heartedly commend the book. It is throughout a pleading for those inner realities which because we can experience them are our greatest joy; and yet because our experience of them must be partial and fragmentary are, at the same time, not the least of our distresses.

J. T. WALLEY.

Bristol, England.

THE CHRISTIAN ETHIC OF WAR. By P. T. Forsyth, M.A., D.D.
London: Longmans, Green & Company, 1916. Pp. x, 196.
Price, 6s. net.

This is a sincere and earnest rather than a clear or a convincing book. As an *argumentum ad hominem* addressed to the Conscientious Objector, whose influence in the Free Churches is far from being a negligible quantity, it is often telling; "to pay taxes . . . is to be as much a partner in the war as fighting would be—with the added enormity of paying others to do an immoral thing which the protestor evades by buying himself off": and it is refreshing to come upon the admission that "Casuistry
Vol. XXVII.—No. 3.

every one has to practice; the question is whether we should use amateur or skilled." But the writer is hampered by a theory of the Atonement without which, he admits, "all I have just been saying falls to the ground as a speculative fantasy," but which few theologians would now discuss seriously. This leaves him open to criticism from more than one side. There are, it seems, three separate Dr. Forsyths: the first as he is, a Puritan of the Cromwellian type, soaked in the Old Testament; the second as he sees himself, an Evangelical Christian nurtured on the New—though on Paul, not on Jesus; the third as he would have others see him, a moral philosopher in revolt against modern ethical conceptions, which (he thinks) lead to what he denounces as an "anthropomorphic religion. That is, its prime interest is man with God to help him. (Ps: xxiii)"—surely a respectable ancestry?—but "it ends in subjective humanism, with God squeezed out." Unlike the Athanasian Trinity, these three are not one. It would be unfair to compare *The Christian Ethic of War* to Monsignor Benson's *Dawn of All*. But a certain purple patch in the latter work will not unfrequently occur to the reader of the former: "The Christ you appeal to is nothing. . . . Have you never heard of the Wrath of the Lamb?"

The points which Dr. Forsyth wishes to make would have been brought out more clearly had he avoided the obscure theology of the Atonement, and taken them on general rather than on distinctively religious ground. "Whoever expects to find in Scripture a specific direction for every moral doubt that arises, looks for more than he will meet with," says Paley. And, while in a historical sense we may speak of "Christian Ethics" with propriety—what is meant being the development of Ethics in Christian Europe—to do so in the sense of a distinct kind, or species, of Ethics, standing over against other kinds, or species, is open to misconception. For the science of conduct is rational, rather than either Christian or non-Christian; and it is one. The distinction between rational and Christian exists for thought rather than in things. There is, no doubt, a difference of accent and emphasis, to miss which is to land oneself in a rather arid intellectualism. But, in substance, Christianity is a republication, re-statement, and reinforcement of the dictates of reason. Hence its power of development; it grows as reason grows. So that an interpretation, whether of Scripture or of Christianity, which is in conflict with reason and with the institutions in which

reason embodies itself—Society, Law, the State—is self-refuted. Such positions are better argued not on the ground of religion—this would be endless—but on that of reason. They are unreasonable, *i.e.*, intellectually foolish, and *therefore* (we may insist upon the consequence), morally wrong. It follows that they are not, and cannot be, Christian: the great text of the Cambridge Platonists was “The spirit of man is the candle of the Lord.” Where the argument is conducted on other lines, it is difficult to avoid the shoals of religious controversy. To the non-theological reader it will probably seem that in the present work the author’s interest is rather theological than ethical; to the theological reader it will seem that the particular theology in whose interest the book has been written is one which has no future and which has had a more than doubtful past.

ALFRED FAWKES.

Ashby St. Ledgers, England.

DIVORCE AS IT MIGHT BE. By E. S. P. Haynes. Cambridge, England: Heffer & Sons. Pp. 81.

Like all Mr. E. S. P. Haynes’ work, these fine essays combine a remarkable range of knowledge with a distinctly individual outlook and style. There is something eighteenth century about their close-grained brevity and precision, the grace and felicity of the dedication to H. G. Wells and the memorable irony of the first three pages, the telling passages on pp. 55–56 and p. 60. But no one who has followed Mr. Haynes’ strenuous fight against stupidity and cruelty in their most jealously guarded preserves, need to be told that the book is modern and vital in the highest degree. The two main essays, which appeared as articles in the *Fortnightly Review*, present a valuable analysis of the Report of the Divorce Law Commission (which endorses in nearly every particular Mr. Haynes’ own suggestions less than six years before), and a bold, comprehensive, constructive defence of divorce by consent, subject to certain time limits and financial provisions. He does not anticipate any legal recognition of divorce by consent in England, for perhaps another century; and here it may be noted that though divorce by consent could be made perfectly compatible with due care for the children, and is the only solution tolerable to human dignity and freedom, yet, if it is not to involve great hardships, injustice to women, it should be post-